A

RELIGIOUS CONTEST.

OR,

A brief account of a disputation holden at *Blyton* in the County of *Lincoln.*

Between

Mr. *William Fort* Minister of the Perochial Congregation at *Blyton* on the one part,

And

Thomas Grantham, Servant to the Baptised Churches on the other part.

Whereunto is added

Brief Animadversions upon Dr. *Stilling-fleet* his Digressions about Infant Baptism:

IN

His Book Intituled, *A rational account of the Protestant Religion*, &c.

In both which are shewed

That the generality of the Nations now professing Christianity, are as yet unbaptised into Christ.

1. Because

Their Sprinkling and Crossing the Fore-head is not the right way of baptising.

2. Because

Infants ought not to be Baptised.

Acts 2. 38.

Repent and be Baptised every one of you in the Name of Jesus Christ for the Remission of Sins, and ye shall receive the gifts of the Holy Ghost.

Mark 16. 16. *He that believeth and is Baptised shall be saved.*

LONDON, Printed in the Year, 1674.

The Epiſtle Dedicatory,

To Mr. *William Fort* and the reſt of the Brethren and Aſſiſtants at the Diſpute holden by his appointment at *Blyton* the 18 day of *September*, 1673.

Reverend Sirs

I Do ſeriouſly account it a part of my infelicity to ſee the diſtractions and diviſions among us touching the Worſhip of Almighty God, and his holy Child Jeſus, whom I truſt we do all love and fear, and therefore it is the greater pitty that we who differ not about the Godhead, ſhould at all differ about the things which pertain to his bleſſed Service. May it therefore pleaſe God to move upon all our hearts to conſider (laying aſide all carnal intereſt) where the cauſes on either ſide are given. And ſith, perhaps we are more quick ſighted about each others miſtakes then our own, give me leave without offence, to ſhew briefly what I conceive is really amiſs on your part, and I ſhall as willingly conſider what may fairly be objected concerning us againſt that conſideration.

Firſt then, when I look upon your *reformation* from Papall errors, I cannot but heartily congratulate the piety and zeal of your Martyrs, &c. Specially in their being inſtrumental to bring that ſacred inſtitute of the *Lords Table* from under manifold corruptions wherewith it had been incumbred in the darkneſs of Popery: But yet withall I muſt needs condole their ſhortneſs in not looking with like diligence to the Priſtine Inſtitution of ſacred Baptiſm, by which overſight we which ſurvive them, are the more expoſed to our preſent diſtractions, and I think I may ſay in this, as *David* in another caſe, becauſe they did it not at the firſt therefore the Lord made a breach upon us.

Secondly, when I conſider the articles of the Church of *England*, I think it very ſtrange that we who agree ſo firmly in them all ſave three or four, and differ but in ſome points touching them neither, ſhould not conſider of ſome expedient to remove what obſtructs our intire agreement.

May it therefore pleaſe your Biſhops, with their Brethren, to admit of a friendly conference with our Biſhops and Paſtors, to try if by any means a way may be found to bring us to brotherly concord, for whatſoever hath happened in the heat of diſputation, or fallen from the Pens of paſſionate Writers on either ſide, yet be pleaſed to know, we are no haters of the pious Proteſtant, but ſincere lovers of them and the truths by them maintain'd, as indeed we ought to be of all who love Chriſt, though differing from us in many things. And though it is true we hold a ſeparation from you in our Congregations, yet we do this of neceſſity, becauſe none among your Leaders will treat with us about the removal of thoſe things which do offend.

I confeſs, to reform what is amiſs on your part touching ſacred Baptiſm is a difficult undertaking, yet not more difficult then it was to reform what was amiſs in the other Sacrament, whether we conſider their errors, who for ſome hundreds of years, gave it to Infants, or theirs who by their tranſubſtantiation changed the very nature of the Sacrament.

But if no endeavours of this kind muſt be admitted, then am I out of hopes ever to ſee Chriſtian concord among us, for thoſe coercive ways (which ſome incline to) will but aggravate the breach (which is too great already) & render your cauſe the more ſuſpitious, and conſequently more confirm us in our perſwaſion againſt your way. Now the Lord himſelf direct us all to the way of truth and peace in all things;

So prays, yours to love and ſerve you in Chriſt as far as permitted, T. G.

The

THE

Epiſtle to the Reader,

Shewing the occaſion of this Diſputation.

Courteous Reader.

Diſputation is not more hurtful when needleſs, then profitable when neceſſity calls for it. And hereupon our Lord Chriſt himſelf was frequent in diſputes about his Doctrine. This way went the Apoſtles to try the matter in Queſtion about Circumciſion, Acts 15. *And* Paul *defended Chriſtianity by diſputing dayly in the School of one* Tyrannus Acts 19.

The occaſion of the diſpute at Blyton, September 18. 1673. *was on this wiſe. A ſmall remnant of baptized Chriſtians meeting in that Town, it pleaſed Mr.* Fort *Miniſter of the Perochial Congregation there, to come to their Meetings, and to hinder their proceedings, ſo that they could not edifie one another, as their manner was. And this he did many times, and told them he was reſolved they ſhould not meet in that Town. And when the* Baptiſts *endeavoured to maintain their principles, he ſlighted them, ſaying they were fooliſh Men not fit to diſcourſe of religion becauſe they underſtood not the rules of Logick, &c. But he bad them find him a Man that had Brains, and underſtood the Languages, and knew Logick and he would diſpute with him. They told him they had few that underſtood theſe things. But he not ceaſing to diſturb them they conſented to his motion, and a day was appointed, and becauſe the* Baptiſts *had not a convenient place, Mr.* Fort *provided a large room, and ſent for them to come thither, where himſelf with two other Miniſters and divers of the Neighbourhood were met togeth r.*

For

For the account of the diſpute it ſelf, take this information that much of it is here reported according to what Memory could ſerve in upon recogitation, but yet be aſſured of this that for ſubſtance it is not altered by this account, the arguments varying very little, or not at all from the very terms wherein they were expreſſed in the Diſpute, and Mr. Fort s *anſwers, rendred rather more advantagious, then in their firſt delivery.*

If it ſeem ſtrange that a Perſon of ſuch Learning and Gravity, ſhould anſwer and argue with no more advantage to his cauſe, the Reader may take notice that God hath ſaid, He will confound the Wiſdom of the Wiſe, and bring to nought the underſtanding of the Prudent *And when he doth this, then where is the* Scribe, *where is the Diſputer of this World.*

Now whereas in this Diſpute I *have uſed the method which the Learned do more affect, then other ways of Diſputing,* I *deſire the* Reader *to take notice, that* I *do not in any thing that* I *have ſaid pretend at all to the Parts of a Scholar, being a Perſon of no education that way, howbeit, having obtained mercy of the Lord, to know ſomewhat of his bleſſed Will, according to his word,* I *am therefore willing to appear in the defence of his Truth when called thereunto.*

Finally, my hearts deſire and prayer to God, is, that though our preſent differences in Religion, *be matter of infelicity, yet ſith we all agree, that Chriſtianity is the only true* Religion *in the world, that we therefore may endeavour to maintain the great engagement of Charity, and Moderation, and then we may expect that the God of Truth and Peace, will pitty us under our miſtakes, and alſo lead us into the enjoyment of that gracious promiſe,* Jer. 32. 39. *Even to give us* one Heart, *and* one Way. *So be it.*

Tho. Grantham.

A Religious Conteſt,

OR,

An account of the Diſpute held at Bly'on the eighteen of *September*, 1673.

The People being come together, Mr. *Fort* applying himſelf to *Thomas Grantham* began after this manner.

SIR, I ſuppoſe that you are come hither to defend ſome unlawful Meetings in this place which I have laboured to ſuppreſs, now that which I have to charge them with is this: That their Meetings are unlawful. 2. That their way of Anabaptiſm is ſinful, And 3. I will prove that our way of baptizing Infants is lawful.

Tho. Grantham.

Sir, I came not hither to defend any Mans ſayings or doings, but to vindicate the truth of the Goſpel (as much as in me is) ſo far as I am concerned, and for Anabaptiſm I am againſt it as much as you, nor do I think it needful to diſpute about the baptizing of Infants till ſome body be found to baptiſe them, for I think that there is no Man in *England* that baptiſeth any Infants.

Mr. *Fort.*

Why this is a ſtrange thing! can any thing be more plain, then that which is *de facto*, and here the three Prieſts fell a laughing.

T. Grantham.

Gentlemen, you have no cauſe to laugh as yet, for I ſay (and ſhall ſhew

ſhew in due place) that neither you nor any in the world that I can hear of does baptiſe any Infants.

Mr. *Fort.*

I tell you friend we do baptiſe them and will you deny a thing that is *de facto*, and here they fell a laughing again.

T. Grantham.

Gentlemen, this doth not become the gravity of your Perſons did you come hither to make ſport? But becauſe you make this ſo ſtrange, give me leave to put you in mind of the Apoſtles ſaying, 1 *Cor.* 11. *This is not to eat the Lords Supper*, and yet the *Corinthians* did celebrate the Lords Supper as they ſuppoſed in the Bread and Wine which they ſet apart, but going from the Inſtitution of Chriſt, the Apoſtle denies it to be the Lords Supper. I therefore ſay you do not baptiſe at all, becauſe you have loſt the Inſtitution of Chriſt.

Mr. *Fort.*

Well, well, but firſt let me hear what you have to ſay for theſe unlawful Meetings which I have endeavoured to ſuppreſs.

T. Grantham.

I am not ſo much a ſtranger to the Meetings you ſpeak of, but I think they may be defended, but yet I ſuppoſe it the beſt way to try our principles, for if they be good, our Meetings to promote good principles need not offend you, and truly till this day, I did not underſtand that our Meetings ſhould be the ſubject of our Diſpute.

Mr. *Fort.*

I perceive thoſe that have informed you have done you ſome injury, for I did ſay, that your Meetings were unlawful and therefore I oppoſed them, and ſeeing you have not premidated this, I will not ſurprize you, but will conſent to diſpute their principles.

T. Grantham.

Sir I thank you for that, and I deſire that the Queſtions may be fairly ſtated to contain the points in difference about the Doctrine of Baptiſm.

Mr. *Fort.*

Well, I agree to that, and pray do you ſtate the Queſtions if you pleaſe.

T. Grantham.

The Queſtions then may be theſe, (*viz.*)

Qu. 1. Whe-

Qu. 1.

Whether your way of baptiſing, be the right way of baptiſing?

Qu. 2.

Whether Infants ought to be baptiſed?

Mr. *Fort.*

Well, let theſe be the Queſtions, I ſay our way of baptiſing is right, and that Infants ought to be baptiſed, and do you prove the contrary if you can.

T. Grantham.

Although you ought to prove what you affirm, yet I will accept your offer, and ſhall ſhew, that your pretended way of baptiſing is not the right way of baptiſing, and that Infants ought not to be baptiſed, and firſt I argue thus.

Arg. 1.

Holy Scripture doth ſhew what is the right way of baptiſing, holy Scripture doth not ſhew ſprinkling or croſſing is the right way of baptiſing, ergo your way of baptiſing is not the right way of baptising.

Mr. Fort

We do not ſay that ſprinkling or croſſing is baptiſing, neither did I ever ſprinkle any in all my life,

T. G.

Then you contradict your brethren, whoſe conſtant practice is known to be ſprinkling and croſſing the Fore-head, yea you contradict your own Common Prayer-book, for there your direction is to ſprinkle and croſs the Infant.

Mr *Fort.*

I confeſs our old Common Prayer-book did uſe the word ſprinkle, but we have now altered it, and it is only baptiſe in the new Common Prayer-book.

T. *Grantham,*

I confeſs reformation is no error, it ſeems then by your own grant your firſt Book was faulty, and for your practiſe it is ſtill the ſame, and I pray, as you are a Schollar tell us plainly, doth the word baptiſe ſignifie to ſprinkle?

M. *Fort.*

No, I do not ſay it doth the word that ſignifies ſprinkling is Rantiſmos

T. G.

In that you ſay well, and now pray anſwer to my Argument, for it proves ſprinkling is not the way of baptiſing,

Mr. *Fort.*

I have told you we do not ſay that ſprinkling is baptiſing, neither do we make the Croſs any part of Baptiſm.

Tho. Grantham.

You do certainly make the Croſs an appurtenance in your Baptiſm. for you will excommunicate ſuch as refuſe to uſe it in Baptiſm, and for ſprinkling I appeal to this Aſſembly, who can witneſs it's the common practice of your Miniſtry to ſprinkle the Fore-head, and it is remarkable that you cannot ſtand by your practice now it is oppoſed. I deſire you to anſwer the Argument.

Mr. *Fort.*

I have anſwered it for I do not ſprinkle, but I always pour water upon thoſe whom I baptiſe, and for my own part I was dipped, and ſo according to your own Judgement rightly baptiſed.

T. Grantham.

If you were dipped then you had more done to you then your Brethren in that caſe, and ſo you are divided in your practice nor is your pouring water on the Fore.head baptiſing. and therefore anſwer the Argument.

Mr. *Fort.*

Here Mr. *Fort* and the other Miniſters ſpake together diſowning ſprinkling, and ſaying they did not make the Croſs neceſſary in Baptiſm, for (ſay they) in private Baptiſm it is not uſed.

T. Grantham.

You know that the Papiſts allow of Midwife to pour water out of a Glaſs upon the Infant, which they account a valid Baptiſm yet at other times they make their ceremonies neceſſary, and ſo do you the Croſs, performing in the name of the Father, Son and holy Spirit.

Mr. *Fort.*

That is not ſo, we do not perform it in the name of the Father, Son, and holy Spirit, therefore you wrong us.

T. Grantham.

This is ſtrange, for either you do it in the name of the Lord, or in your own name, if you do it in your own name pray tell us ſo, but you anſwer not the Argument, therefore I proceed.

Arg. 2.

That which renders the practiſe of Chriſt and his Apoſtles Superfluous, or ridiculous, is not the right way of Baptiſing.

But your pretended way of Baptising renders the practice of Christ and his Disciples superfluous, or ridiculous,

Ergo. Your way of Baptising is not the right way of Baptising.

Mr. *Fort.*

The minor is denyed our way of Baptising doth not render the practice of Christ or his Disciples superfluous or ridiculous.

T. Grantham.

The minor I evince by this demonstration, he that considers how Christ and his Disciples were baptised, and did baptise in Rivers or Places of much water, and you on the other side take a little water on your finger ends, or in your hand only, must needs conclude that either they did too much, or you do too little; Now thus it is written, Mat. 3 *Jesus when he was baptized came up streight way out of the Water*, Mark 1. *They were all baptized in the River of Jordan, confessing their sins. John* baptised in *Enon* because there was much water there. *Phillip* and the *Eunuch* went both down into the water. Now if your putting a few drops of water on the Fore-head only, be sufficient then the other must needs be superfluous, yea ridiculous.

Mr. *Fort.*

This does not prove the minor, for we do not deny dipping, and I pray what do you mean when you say our way renders Christs to be ridiculous.

T. Grantham.

I mean a thing to be laughed at, and put the case you had occasion to wash your hands only, would it not be ridiculous to see you go into the River to do it? even does thus your pretended way of baptising, render the way of Christ ridiculous and reflects dishonour on him and his followers, as if they were not so wise as you, to know the best way to be baptized, but we are resolved to follow Christ though we differ from you.

Mr. *Fort.*

Yes, the word ridiculous doth signifie so much, but yet I deny that our practise doth reflect upon Christs, for though in these hot Countreys they did dip in Rivers, yet it was not necessary in these colder Countreys to do so, for Christ hath not commanded that.

T. Grantham.

Then you confess it was the practice of the first christians to

dip in Rivers, and I ask you whether they did this by a command or not?

Mr. Fort.

Yes, I grant they did it by a command.

T. Grantham.

Then you have granted ſufficient to overthrow your practice, and to confirm ours, unleſs you can alſo ſhew a command for ſprinkling.

Mr. Fort.

I have told you I do not ſprinkle.

T. Grantham:

The contrary is the known practice of your Miniſtry, and yours is little differing, I proceed to another Argument.

Arg. 3.

That which brings unavoidable confuſion into the Church is not the right way of baptiſing:

But your way of baptiſing doth bring unavoidable confuſion into the Church.

Ergo, your way of baptiſing is not the right way of baptiſing

Mr. Fort.

Our practice in baptiſing as we do, doth not bring confuſion into the Church.

T. Grantham.

I ſhew the contrary thus, your way of baptiſing admits of as many ſeveral ways, as there are parts in a mans body; for whether the Fore-head, the Breaſt, Back, Hand or Foot, or ſome other part ought to be only ſprinkled, or whether any of theſe may not ſerve, you can ſhew no reaſon, ſo that you thus bring confuſion into the Church:

Mr Fort.

The Head being the moſt honourable part of mans body, we therefore chuſe the head and think that the beſt.

T. Grantham

This is only your imagination, and if I think otherwiſe, and ſo chuſe the breaſt, you cannot ſhew this to be a greater errour then your own, but I proceed.

Arg. 4.

That which renders all Men uncertain whether they do the will of God or not, is not the right way of baptiſing,

But

But your way of baptising doth render all Men uncertain whether they do the will of God or not,

Ergo, your way of baptising is not the right way of baptising.

Mr. Fort

I deny that our way renders men uncertain, whether they do the will of God or not.

T. G.

God hath not assigned any one part of the body to be baptised, and not another, therefore no man that follows your way can tell whether he do the will of God or not, in following your way:

Arg. 5.

That way which doth not signifie that which ought to be represented in baptism is not the right way of baptising.

But your pretended way doth not signifie that which ought to be represented in baptism.

Ergo. Your way of Baptising is not the right way of Baptising.

Mr Fort.

Our way of baptising doth signifie the cleansing of the conscience from Sin which is the thing that ought to be signified in baptism:

T. G.

No action of mans devising may be said to signifie the cleansing our consciences from Sin, but my argument refers to the whole signification of baptism, and particularly the burial of Christ and others with him, *Rom.* 6 we are buried with him in baptism, and the Scripture cannot be broken, therefore baptism must so be performed as to signifie these things:

Arg. 6.

That which agrees not with the native signification of the word Βαπτίζω *is not the right way of Baptising.*

But your way agrees not with the native signification of the word Βαπτίζω:

Ergo, your way is not the right way of baptising.

Mr. Fort

The minor is denied, our practice agrees with the signification of the word Βαπτίζω:

T. G.

I desire you to shew the place which mentions such a washing as you practice, where the word Βαπτίζω is taken to express the sacred act of baptism:

Mr.

Mr. *Fort.*

It is ſaid the Phariſes did waſh their cups and beds; here the word Baptizo is uſed, yet they did not dip them.

T. Grantham.

I call'd for a Text wher the word Βαπτίζω is uſed to expreſs the ſacred Act of baptiſm, and that ſignifies *your manner of waſhing*, and inſtead of this, you bring me a place which ſpeaks of the Phariſes waſhing cups and beds, and yet even this place is againſt you, for they that waſh defiled cups and beds do more then ſprinkle them, or poure a little water upon them, as you do on the Infants Forehead; and here give me leave to urge ſome Authorities for the ſignifiication of the word Βαπτίζω to be a dipping of the thing denominated baptized, and firſt I urge the *Greek Grammer*, where the radix is Βάπτω and rendred, *mergo, immergo*, to dip or plunge.

Mr. *Fort.*

I will not regard the Greek Grammar.

T. Grantham.

This is ſtrange! will you take upon you to correct the Greek Grammar.

Mr. *Fort.*

Yes that I will, I will not believe the Greek Grammar.

T. Grantham.

I ſuppoſe you would correct our Bibles too if you could, but till this be done give us leave to believe the Grammar which we have. for I do not expect a better from you; my next Authority is that of *Chanier*, who ſaith Βαπτίζειν *eſtingo quod fit immergendo portinctionem, & inundationem.*

Mr. *Fort.*

I have not ſeen that Author.

T. Grantham.

Then I give you another: Ambroſe ſaith, *ergo fratres tingi debens in illum fonte quo Chriſtus.* Therefore brethren we muſt be dipped in the ſame Fountain with Chriſt, that we may be one with Chriſt, and to this agree the decrees of ſome *Councells.*

Mr. *Fort.*

Pray Aſſign thoſe counſells that decreed ſuch a thing if you can.

T. *Grantham.*

The *forth Toletan* counſell (which is ratified in the Decretalls) ſaith

saith *propter vitandum schismatis scandalum, &c.* Wherefore to avoid the scandal of schism, let us in baptism dip but once and saith the counsell of worms, *In aquas demersio in infernum est, & rursus ab aquis emersio resurrectio est.*

Mr. *Fort.*

Well, I have told you I was dipped yet I had but my head only dipped, and for my part I do not use sprinkling at all.

T. Grantham.

Sir, I have shewed how therein you contradict your Brethren and the Church of *England*, and it's observable that you cannot stand by your way of baptising, and hereby you give this Assembly just cause to suspect their baptism, but I proceed.

Arg. 7.

That practice which was innovated long after the institution of baptism is not the right way of baptising.

But your way was innovated long after the institution of baptism.

Ergo, your way is not the right way of baptising.

Mr. *Fort.*

I deny that our way was innovated long after the institution of baptism.

T. *Grantham.*

I can prove it was innovated long after the institution of baptism by your own Doctors. For example, *Hugo Grotius* who confesses so much in his *judgement on sundry points controverted,*

Also the Learned Marquess of *Worcester* in his conference with His Late Majesty confesses that their Church (to wit the Papists) changed baptism from dipping over head and ears to a little sprinkling upon the Forehead, and *Walfridus Strabo de rebus ecclesiæ*, that the *first Christians were baptized simply in floods and fountains*, yea I can prove by our own chronicles that there were about ten thousand baptised in one day in the River *Swale* in *York-shire*, from all which it appears your way of sprinkling is an innovation.

Mr. *W*

Mr. *Wright* one of the Ministers that sat by was very angry and stood up, saying; you speak all, it is not fit you should speak so much.

T. Grantham

To whom T. G. replyed Sir you ought not to be angry; I do not interrupt Mr. *Fort*, and he hath time to speak what he hath

to

to ſay: therefore blame not me ſith I hear as well as ſpeak.

Mr. *Fort.*

Pray Mr *Wright* be not angry; I promiſed it ſhould be a peaceable diſpute.

T. Grantham.

Becauſe I would give place that Mr. *Fort* might have time to prove his practice, I would now proceed to the ſecond Queſtion, (*viz.*)

Qu. 2. *Whether Infants ought to be baptized, I am to prove they ought not, which I thus do,*

Arg. 1.

Holy Scripture doth ſhew who are to be baptized, Holy Scripture doth not ſhew that Infants ought to be baptiſed.

Ergo, Infants ought not to be baptiſed.

Mr. Fort.

Holy Scripture doth ſhew that Infants ought to be baptiſed.

Thomas Grantham.

If Holy Scripture doth ſhew that Infants ought to be baptiſed, then ſome body can ſhew where it may be found, but no body can ſhew us where ſuch a Scripture may be found.

Ergo Holy Scripture doth not ſhew that Infants ought to be baptiſed.

Mr. *Fort.*

I can ſhew where it may be found, and I will prove that Infants ought to be baptiſed, from Mat. 28 19.

T. *Grantham*

Sir, you miſtake your place, for you are not now to prove, but to anſwer me, nor doth the text you mention ſpeak of Infant baptiſm at all.

Mr. *Fort.*

The word is μαθητεύσατε make Diſciples in all Nations baptiſing them, but Infants are part of the Nations that are to be baptiſed.

T. Grantham.

You do violate the Law of diſputing for being my reſpondent you ought not to argue. Now for the Text it is read thus πορευθέντες οὖν μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα πατρὸς &c.

Now for the explication of the Verb μαθητεύσατε, I refer you to *John* the 4 1. μαθητὰς ποιεῖν here Diſciples are made ſuch by actual teaching: Ergo, Infants cannot be made Diſciples according to *Mat.* 28. 19.

Mr. Fort.

I deny, that it is neceſſary to underſtand an actual teaching by the word μαθητεύσατε

T. G.

The very reading of the Text gives it against you, for it saith go teach all Nations, twas an act to be done by the Apostles.

Mr. *Fort.*

I tell you Infants of believers are disciples and need no act to make them so.

T. G.

That cannot be, they must be made disciples either by God or Man before they can be disciples, however they cannot be disciples according to Mat. 28. Because that is interpreted by your self to make disciples, (viz.) by the Apostles.

Mr. *Fort.*

But there is no necessity to understand an actual teaching of all that are to be made disciples.

T. Grantham.

It can have no other signification, as I shall shew by your own Criticks, who tell us that the μανθανω *est disco*, to learn or get knowledge, and in the Hebrew μαθητὴς ποιεῖν is חלמד & עשה תלכד דם comes of למד *didicit* and is rendred *discens ab alio*, which agrees with the Syriack תלמדי and the Arab. תלמראו this fully accords with *Mark* 16. 16. go preach the Gospel to every creature and hence I argue. If those that are to be baptised according to Mat. 28. 19. must first be made by actual teaching or learning from another, then no infant ought to be baptised according to this Text but the first is true: Ergo, so is the latter.

Mr. *Fort.*

I will prove that infants ought to be baptised as being disciples from *Acts* 15. Why tempt ye God to put a yoke upon the necks of the disciples? this is spoken of infants, and therefore they are disciples.

T. G.

Sir, I marvel you should no better observe the Law of disputing which I must hold you to, and the rather because you were pleas'd to glory so much over your poor Neighbours because of your skill in Logick, and now I will shew your mistake of this Text by the prosecution of my next Argument which is this.

Arg 2

None ought to be baptised but such as are Christs Disciples, according to the gospel use of that expression.

Infants are not Christs Disciples according to the gospel use of that expression. Ergo infants ought not to be baptized.

Mr. *Fort.*

I deny the minor, Infants are Chriſts Diſciples according to the Goſpel uſe of that expreſſion.

T. Grantham.

None are Chriſts Diſciples according to the goſpel uſe of that expreſſion, but ſuch as take up their croſs daily and follow Chriſt, but Infants do not ſo. Ergo, to this agree the words of Chriſt, Luk. 12.

Mr. *Fort.*

This place ſpeaks of perſons of years, and not of Infants.

T. Grantham.

I grant it, and ſo doth every Text that ſpeaks of Chriſts Diſciples according to the goſpel uſe of that expreſſion.

Mr. *Fort.*

Not ſo, for I will ſhew a place where Infants are called Diſciples, Acts 15. Here ſuch as were to be circumciſed after the maaner of *Moſes* are called Diſcipies and you know Infants were circumciſed after the maaner of *Moſes*.

T. Grantham.

That Infants were circumciſed after the manner of *Moſes* is true, and that the falſe Apoſtles would have put the yoke upon all the Diſciples is true, but that every one upon whom they would have put that yoke were Diſciples is not true; I will expound this text by another, *Acts* 4.32. here we are informed that the multitude of them that believed had all things common, yet it doth not follow that all that had part in theſe common things were believers, for Infants had part in common things, and yet were no believers, for it's ſaid the multitude of them that believed were of one heart, and one Soul.

Mr. *Fort.*

That text doth not expound the other.

T. Grantham.

Let them be diligently compared, and you will find that a man may as well prove Infants believers from the one, as you can prove them Diſciples from the other, but I proceed.

Arg. 3.

None ought to be baptized but thoſe whoſe duty it is to be born again of water and of the ſpirit.

It is not the duty of Infants to be born again of water and the ſpirit.

Ergo, Infants ought not to be baptiſed.

Mr.

Mr. *Fort.*

I except against the term duty in your Argument.

T. Grantham.

Why so?

Mr. *Fort.*

There are four terms in your Argument;

T. Grantham.

This is but an evasion, and no answer, you cannot shew four terms in it.

Mr. *Fort.*

I say Infants ought to be born again of water and of the spirit.

T. Grantham.

Here you grant that they ought to be born again of water, and of the spirit, and yet deny it to be their duty, this is no good distinction to make the new birth no part of mans duty, but I will prove that whosoever is born again must therein perform duty, 1 *Joh.* 5. whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world, and this is the victory even our faith: certainly to believe and overcome the world is something of duty.

Mr. *Fort,*

This place speaks not of Infants, but of persons which are Adult.

T. Grantham

I grant it, but withall I say this Text speaketh of whatsoever is born of God, and saith Christ, every one that is born of the spirit is like the wind that bloweth so as the sound thereof is heard now can you imagine your Infants are born again of the spirit, seeing they give not any demonstration of it?

Mr. *Fort.*

You still insist upon places which speak of adult persons.

T. Grantham.

I have told you that all the Scriptures which speak of the new birth of water and of the spirit, speaks of adult persons, or if any speak of Infants pray shew us where they are.

Arg. 4.

No sinners ought to be baptized, but those of whom faith and repentance is first required,

Faith and repentance are not required of Infants,

Ergo, Infants are not such sinners as ought to be baptized.

Mr. *Fort.*

This Argument is like the rest, you still insist upon those things which are the duty of adult persons.

T. *Grantham*

Your conſcience tells you that I inſiſt upon thoſe things which are the duty of all that are to be baptiſed; yea your vulgar Catechiſm teacheth us that faith and repentance are required of all that are to be baptiſed, but ſeeing you anſwer not, but evade only, I ſhall proceed.

Arg. 5.

All that ought to be buried with Chriſt in Baptiſm, ought firſt to be dead with him from the rudiments of the world. Infants ought not to be dead with Chriſt from the rudiments of the world. Ergo, Infants ought not to be Baptiſed.

Mr. *Fort.*

I deny the conſequence.

T. Grantham.

No Sir, you cannot deny the conſequence in a Categoricall ſyllogiſm, ſo that you muſt either diſtinguiſh, or deny one of the propoſitions.

Mr. *Fort.*

Well then, I deny your major.

T. G.

I need but only ſhew the abſurdity of this your denyal, for you ſay in effect that ſome are to be buried before they be dead, now that all Chriſtians in *Rome* and *Coloſs* were dead with Chriſt, before they were buried with him in baptiſm, is evident, *Rom.* 6. 1, 2, 3, 4, *Coloſ.* 2. 10, 11, 12. and is as true of all other Churches, by which it is plain that no Infants were then, nor ought now to be baptiſed.

Arg. 6.

Such only ought to be baptiſed as Chriſt and his Apoſtles did baptiſe, or appointed to be baptiſed, but neither Chriſt nor his Apoſtles baptiſed any Infants, nor appointed them to be baptiſed, Ergo.

M. *Fort.*

Chriſt did appoint Infants to be baptiſed, and ſaid ſuffer little Children to come unto me and forbid them not, *Mat.* 18.

T. *Grantham,*

All that can fairly be inferred of this paſſage is this, that if any deſire the Prayers of the Miniſters of Chriſt for their Children *&c.* they may lawfully pray for ſuch bleſſings as they have need of; but if any preſume to baptiſe them, they do more to them then Chriſt did, or any other by his appointment.

Mr. *Fort.*

The Jaylor and all his were baptiſed, and how can you think there were no Infants in his houſe,

T.

T. Grantham.

The very reading of this Text doth ſhew, that there were no Infants baptiſed, for firſt the word was Preached to him and to all that were in his houſe, ſecondly he rejoyced believing in God with all his houſe: I deſire no better evidence againſt your Infant baptiſm then the place you bring for it.

Arg. 7.

All that are to be Baptiſed ought therein to worſhip God in ſpirit and truth, as alſo in other general duties of the new Teſtament.

But Infants ought not to worſhip God in ſpirit and in truth in Baptiſm, nor any other general duty of the new Teſtament. Ergo, Infants ought not to be Baptiſed.

Mr. Fort.

What do you mean by the general duties of the new Teſtament?

T. G.

I mean Prayer, hearing the Word, and Communion at the Lords Table according to *Acts.* 2. 41. 42.

Mr. Fort

This is ſpoken of grown Perſons, and not of Infants.

T. Grantham.

This is ſpoken of all that were baptiſed in the firſt Church, whoſe pattern we ought to follow, rather then the innovations of Men.

Mr. *Fort.*

Your way is an innovation not much above two hundred years old.

Tho. Grantham.

Not ſo, for our way of baptiſing began in the days of *John* the Baptiſt, and for our oppoſing Infant baptiſm 'tis very antient, for as ſoon as we hear it mentioned we find it oppoſed by *Tertullian* who lived in the third Century:

Mr. Fort.

Tertullian is conceived to oppoſe only the Baptiſing of the children of unbelievers:

T. G.

That is a great miſtake, his words are indefinite, for he ſaith, *veniant ergo dum adoleſcunt, veniant dum diſcunt, dum quo veniant docentur, fiant Chriſtiam cum Chriſtum noſſe potuerint.*

Mr. *W.*

Mr. *Wright* who was one of the other Prieſts, ſtood up and ſaid, let the buſineſs be put to that iſſue, for you only have *Tertullian* for the Antients, and he was a Mantaniſts.

T.

T. *Grantham.*

If he muſt be lightly looked at becauſe he was in ſome errour, as that of *Montanus*, then you muſt lay aſide moſt of the antient Fathers who alſo had their errours, but you are miſtaken *Tertullian* was not the only perſon among the Antients that oppoſed Infant baptiſm, for *Greg. Nazianzene* did likewiſe diſſwade from it.

Mr. *Wright.*

We have *Irenæus* before *Tertullian* who ſpeaks for Infant baptiſm for he ſaith *Infantes pueris ſenis.*

T. Grantham,

You act his words amiſs, for it is not *ſenis* but *ſeniores.*

Mr. *Wright.*

It is *ſenis*, it is *ſenis.*

T. Grantham,

You miſtake it is *ſeniores*, and beſide *Irenæus* ſpeaks not of baptiſm, only he uſeth the words, *renaſcuntur in deum.*

Mr. Fort

The Antients underſtood by them words to be baptized.

T. G.

It is inconvenient ſo to interpret *Irenæus* in this place; for then it would follow that unleſs Infants be baptiſed they cannot be ſaved, which is abſurd, but I deſire you to anſwer to the Argument

Mr. *Fort* ſeemed not diſpoſed to give any further anſwer: then *T. Grantham* ſaid, I have propounded and proſecuted 7 Arguments againſt your pretended way of baptiſing, and 7 againſt your Infant ſubject, of what weight they are, and how you have anſwered them, we are no proper Judges, but muſt leave that to the Auditors; now becauſe I would not take up the whole time, I deſire you to be Opponent, and I will anſwer you: I conclude with the words of *Auguſtine, Nec ego te, nec tu me, ſed ambo audiamus Chriſti in Scripturis.*

Mr. *Fort* Opponent.

I am now to prove our way of baptiſing to be the right way of baptiſing, and that Infants ought to be baptiſed.

Arg. 1.

If our way of baptising doth signifie that which ought to be signified in baptism, then it is the right way of baptising.

But our way of baptising doth signifie that which ought to be signified in baptism. Ergo, it is the right way of baprising.

T. Grantham.

If you mean that your way of baptising doth signifie all that ought to be signified in baptism, then I deny the minor, and we have before shewed how short it comes of the true and full signification of baptism.

Mr. Fort.

Our way of baptising signifies the washing away of sins, and it agrees with the signification of the word Βαπτίζω which is to wash, therefore it is sufficient.

T. Grantham.

The contrary to this hath been shewed and I now deny that every kind of washing agrees with the signification of the word Βαπτίζω when used to express the sacred act of baptising, and I desire you to shew one text where that word is taken for a washing the Fore-head only when the sacred act of baptising is expressed by it.

Mr Fort.

The Jaylor was baptised at midnight; and do you think he had a River in his house?

T. *Grantham*

You are much mistaken the Jaylor went out to be baptised:

Mr. *Fort.*

You cannot make that appear.

T. Grantham.

Yes the reading of the text is plain to that purpose, for it is said *he was* baptised, he, and all his straightway, and then it follows, and when he had brought them into his house, he set meat before them.

Mr. *Fort.*

That may be meant of carrying them out of one room into another

T. *Grantham.*

This is contrary to common sence; you cannot speak your conscience in this.

Mr. Fort.

I have shewed our way of baptizing is sufficient, I will now prove that Infants ought to be baptised.

Arg.

Arg, 2,

If Infants are within the Covenant of grace then they ought to be sealed with the seal of the Covenant, and by consequence to be baptised,

But Infants are within the Covenant of grace and ought to be sealed, &c, Ergo, they ought to be baptized.

T. *Grantham.*

Before I answer your argument give me leave to ask you a Question, How many Seals belong to the Covenant of grace, and what be they ?

Mr. *Fort.*

There are two Seals of the Covenant, to wit, Baptism, and the Lords Supper:

T, G.

Then I deny your minor proposition from your own practice, for you deny Infants one of these Seals, to wit, the Lords Supper, though you confess them to be within the Covenant, and we by as good reason deny the other Seal to belong to Infants:

Mr. Fort.

Yes, we have better reason for the one then you have for the other, for it is said; let a man examine himself, and so let him eat.

T. Granthar.

1. It is also said, Repent and be baptised every one of you, *Acts* 2. 38. if thou believest with all thine heart thou maist. 2. I might answer your instance out of your own mouth, by saying this is meant of persons of years, and not of infants, which as it is true so it shews the weakness of your answers to many of my Arguments.

Mr. *Fort.*

I say infants being in the Covenant they ought to be sealed with the seal, and I pray tell me plainly whether you hold them in the Covenant or no?

T. G.

If by being in the covenant you mean the grace of Eternal Life by the death of Christ, then I say all infants are so in the covenant of grace but if by covenant you mean the duties of the covenant, then I say infants are not so under the covenant.

Mr Fort.

You cannot prove that all infants dying in infancy shall be saved.

T. G.

Yes if it were my business, I could and would prove it, but I am not to answer you.

Mr. *Fort.*

I will give you leave to prove it if you can.

T.

T. Grantham.

Then I prove it by the teſtimony of the Apoſtle, who ſaith as in *Adam* all dye, ſo in Chriſt ſhall all be made alive, and again as by the offence of once the Judgement came on all men to condemnation, ſo by the obedience of one the free gift abounded towards all men to juſtification of life.

Mr. *Fort.*

Theſe places do not prove that all Infants dying in infancy ſhall be ſaved; for he ſpeaks here only of the reſurrection of the Dead.

T. G.

Theſe places do ſhew that what death and condemnation came on infants by *Adam* is made void by the death of Chriſt, and I deſire you to anſwer me this Queſtion, whether you believe that any infants dying in infancy ſhall be damned;

Mr. *Fort.*

yes I do believe ſome infants dying in infancy ſhall be damned, (here the people gave a general ſigh as disliking ſo harsh a ſaying.)

T. G.

Then you are no friend to infants; ſhall the Lord tell us, the Son ſhall not bear the iniquity of the father, and ſhall we not believe him.

Mr. *Fort.*

The Lord doth ſay he will viſit the iniquities of the father upon the children unto the third and fourth generation.

T. *G.*

yea Sir, but it is of them that hate him, but yet I grant in reſpect of temporal puniſhments the children do often bear the iniquities of their fathers, yea, all infants do bear the ſin of their father Adam to this day, but our diſcourſe is of eternal condemnation, in which reſpect I ſay infants ſhall not bear the iniquity of their father, ſeeing Chriſt ſaith of infants indefinitely, of ſuch are the kingdom of God,

Mr. *Fort*

Well I have ſhewed that infants being in the Covenant ought therefore to be baptized, and it is ſaid 1 *Cor.* 7. that infants are holy and ſo they are in Covenant with their believing parents.

T. G:

I have anſwered your argument by diſtinguiſhing betwixt the duty of the covenant, and the mercy of eternal life, in the firſt I ſay infants are not in the covenant, but in the other I ſay they are for they ſhall be ſaved by Chriſt.

And for the holineſs the 1 *Cor.* 7. it is expounded by Eraſmus, and others of your own Doctors to be only a legirtimate holineſs, and indeed being derived from the unbelievers being ſanctified, it cannot fairly be underſtood of any other kind of cleanneſs then that which is Matrimonial.

Mr. *Wright*

Mr. *W.* interpoſed ſaying *Diodate* doth expound that place of a covenant holineſs.

T. G.

I grant he doth ſo, yet *Auguſtine* far more antient then he ſaith, *that whatſoever that Holineſs is it is certain it is not of power to make Chriſtians or remit ſins.*

Mr. F.

I marvel you ſhould deny infants the ſeal ſeeing you grant them to be in the covenant.

T. G.

I do not deny them the seal any more then your self, who deny them the Lords Supper, which was allowed them in old time for 600 years together.

Mr. F.

What Author saies so? I do not think you can shew that in any good author.

T. G.

I can shew it from your own Doctors in a learned treatise called a *Scholastical discourse about symbolising with Anti-Christ in Ceremonies.*

Mr. Fort.

Infants being in the Covenant are in the Church, and therefore cannot be denyed baptism,

T. Grantham.

I answer by the former distinction if by being in the Covenant and in the Church you mean the whole number of the saved: I grant infants to be in the Covenant and in the Church; but if you mean those onlie who are in the actual profession of gospel Ordinances, as baptism and the like, I say no Scripture shews them to be so in the Covenant.

Mr. *Fort* repeating what he said before, rose up to go away, then *Tho. Grantham* said.

Gentlemen, though we differ in opinion, yet I desire we may endeavour to maintain the great duty of Charitie towards each other, till God shall rectifie our judgements in these things.

Mr. *W.*

Mr. *Wright* replied, saying it was not meet to place all our Religion in these things, but to walk in love one towards another, or to this effect, and thus in a friendlie manner the meeting was dissolved & everie man went away in peace.

The next day the baptised Christians met together to preach the Word: *Mr. Fort* and *Mr. Wright* came to the meeting and in a very civil manner assaied to discourse with them about the Authoritie by which they Preach, supposing that they had no ordinarie calling to the ministry, but when it was shewed them that no man was allowed to minister in the baptised Churches in the capacity of a Pastor or other Officer, without due election and ordination by fasting and prayer, with the laying on of hands by the Presbiterie, Bishops, or overseers of the Church, they then onlie opposed that libertie of Prophecie, which we allow, saying that gifted men in the church, as meer gifted christians might not praie, or expound the Word in publick assemblies, we on the contrarie alledgd that gifted christians as such might lawfullie speak in the church to exhortation, &c. in a modest and humble manner for the improvement of gifts and the profit of the church. Quoting to this purpose 1 *Pe.* 4, 10, 11. 1 *Cor.* 14. 31. *Acts* 18. 25 26.

We spent about half an hour in friendlie discourse about the meaning of those Scriptures, but not agreeing in our expositions, *Mr. Fort* took his leave, and we proceeded in our work.

FINIS.

Brief
ANIMADVERSIONS
UPON
Dr. STILLINGFLEET's
Digreſſions about the Baptiſing of Infants,

In his Book intituled

A Rational account of the grounds of the Proteſtant Religion. &c.

Wherein

The inſufficiency of his grounds for Infant Baptiſm is diſcovered.

By *Thomas Grantham.*

Job. 14. 4.

Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean one.

Iſa. 29. 16.

Surely your turning things upſide down ſhall be eſteemed as the potters Clay.

LONDON,

Printed in the Year, 1674.

To the Reader.

IT is not any conceit of my fitness to contend with Learned Men in the controversies depending about sacred Baptism, which moves me to this present undertaking, but the experience I have of the mistake of some persons, who take the things brought by Dr. *Stilling-fleet* in favour of Infant Baptism, to be of greater weight then what hath been done by other Men in that question, as also I might by this Paper move some abler hand to reckon more fully and Methodically with his new devices, if upon consideration they find themselves concerned to do it.

But chiefly my aim is, to move, if it may be, the learned Authour, to consider how much he injures the Cause he manages against the Papists, with so much Judgement and Learning, whilst he endeavours to support his Traditional *Infant Sprinkling* (for Baptism it is not) which being allowed, other innovations of Popery, or other Sects will certainly be supported together with it, as having the same grounds, and in some respect fairer pretences to obtrude upon the Church of God, from all which errours let her be delivered, by the protection of the Almighty, to whose grace I comit thee.

Thine to serve thee in Christ.

Tho. Grantham.

Brief Animadverſions upon Dr. *Stillingfleet's* Digreſſions about the Baptiſing of Infants.

SOlomon the wiſe, hath told us, there are many devices in Mans heart. The truth whereof is verified in the multitude of devices old and new which Men have found out to darken the Counſell of God, teaching the ſacred inſtitution of the Baptiſm of Repentance for the remiſſion of ſins. Nevertheleſs the Counſell of God that ſhall ſtand, and therefore neither ſhall the devices of Dr. *Stillingfleet* prevail, nor be found ſo much as a *rational account* of the grounds of Infant Baptiſm, albeit divers Perſons are perſwaded that he hath out-done others, that have undertaken to defend that innovation.

1. Firſt, Therefore we ſhall conſider the two Texts, *John* 3. 5. *Act.* 2. 38, 39. which he ſays, according to the interpretation of the *Fathers* and the antient Church and the *Papiſts* themſelves do evidently aſſert Infant Baptiſm. It were anſwer ſufficient to tell him, that what ever was the interpretation of the Fathers, *&c.* yet, according to the interpretation of the Proteſtants, the grounds of whoſe Religion he preſents to give an account of, theſe Texts, doth not hold forth ſuch a neceſſity of Infant Baptiſm, as by ſome of the Antients was imagined, ſeeing the Proteſtants do not ſay, as the Papiſts and ſome before them, *no Baptiſm no ſalvation*; but they more truly teach, that this place is to be underſtood (even as ſome of the Fathers alſo expounded it) of ſuch as refuſe or contemn Baptiſm, and yet ſaying withall to your confutation, that it is not neceſſary by water, *John*, 3. 5. To underſtand the external rite of Baptiſm. See *Fulk.* Anſ. to the Rhemiſts Annot. *John* 3. ſo Dr. *Willet Synopſ. Papiſ.*

However, it is evident to them that will not ſhut their eyes that in *John* 3. 5. Chriſt is ſhewing the way of Life, and the duties of regeneration to ſuch as came to him for inſtruction, and ſpeaks nothing there, of the caſe of Infants, who (as one well obſerves) cannot overcome the World, by reaſon of their natural incapacity to know

know either good or evil, and therefore are not obliged to the duties of the new birth, to wit, repentance, faith and Baptism, for whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world, and this is the victory that overcometh the world even our faith. And hence it is evident that *John* 3. 5. cannot be understood of Infants, who are wholly uncapable of the duties of regeneration.

And as evident it is, that Acts 2. 38. 39. intends not Infants seeing the persons there to be baptised, *even every one of them*, are required first to repent; a duty of which Infants are wholly uncapable; and the promise there mentioned is clearly meant of the gifts of the Holy Ghost or the Spirit of promise in a special manner, according to the Prophesie of *Joel*, the extent of which promise is only to the called of the Lord, *verse* 39. and this interpretation also is avouched by learned Protestants, See *Diodate* on the Text, and *Erasmus* on the same; Dr *Jer. Taylor* in his book of confirmation doth fully expound this place, of the promise of the Spirit both to the Parents, and to the Children, as they are the called of the Lord, and not to infants in that capacity. *Lib. Prophecy.* So then the pretended evidence of Infant Baptism from this place is taken away, because this truth is hence very evident, that calling by the word of the Gospel regeneration by Faith and repentance are the true antecedents to the Baptism of every sinner.

2. Secondly, Dr *Stelling-fleet* states the Question between the *Baptists* and the *Pado-Baptists* after this manner.

Whether our blessed Saviour hath by a positive precept so determined the subject of baptism, viz. *Adult persons professing the faith, that the alteration of the subject, in baptising Infants be not a deviation from, and a perversion off the institution of Christ in a substantial part of it? or to short, whether our Saviour hath so determined the subject of baptism as to exclude infants.*" This done he tells us that taking in only the help of Scripture and reason, it were no difficult matter to prove directly that infants are so far from being excluded Baptism by the institution of Christ, that there are as many grounds as are necessary to a matter of that nature, to prove that the baptising them is suitable to the institution of Christ and agreeable to the state of the Church under the Gospel. So then, Scripture and reason only must now decide the controversie, Let us hear therefore what Dr. *Stelling fleet* brings from thence, and this he speaks.

" In

"If there were any ground to exclude them it muſt be either the "incapacity of the ſubject or ſome expreſs precept and inſtitution of "our Saviour, but neither of them can be ſuppoſed to do it.

But I anſwer, for both theſe cauſes Infants are not to be baptiſed, and ſith their incapacity depends upon the nature of the inſtitution theſe two reaſons are reſolved into one; Now the inſtitution of baptiſm, whether we conſider it as delivered by God to his Servant *John*, and by him to us; or as it is eſtabliſhed by precept from Chriſt, for a perpetual Miniſtry in his Church to the end of the world we ſhall find it delivered by both in ſuch ſort, as it is excluſive of infants; for, in the firſt place it is delivered as the baptiſm of repentance for the remiſſion of ſins; *Mark* 1. 4. and every ſinner who is ſaid to be baptiſed by him, is ſaid to be baptiſed confeſſing their ſins, *verſe* 5. which we know is not to be expected of Infants.

The precept of our Saviour for the perpetuity of Baptiſm ſo expreſly requires the making every ſubject a Diſciple in order thereunto, and that by actual teaching, or preaching the Goſpel to them, *Mat.* 28. 19. *Mark* 16 15. according to Chriſts own example, who ſo made Diſciples before they were baptiſed, that no Infant with any ſhew of Scripture or reaſon can poſſibly be brought within the reach of baptiſm according to it's inſtitution; In a word Dr. *Stillingfleet* ſeems, in ſo many words, to grant in his firſt ſtate of the Queſtion that to bring Infants to Baptiſm, is an alteration of the ſubject, and therefore not agreeable to the inſtitution of Chriſt, in which to admit of alterations is very dangerous.

But ſaith Dr. S. *The rule and meaſure as to the capacity of divine Inſtitutions muſt be fetched from the end of them, for this was the ground of the Circumciſion of Proſelites under the Law.*

Anſwer, That the ground of the circumciſion of Proſelites was fetched from the end of the inſtitution, is not true. And indeed had it been left to that, Mens various conceits about the ends of ſuch inſtitutions might have made as ill work, as we ſee yours do now; wherefore the wiſdom of God to prevent thoſe dangers, gave expreſs order in that caſe as appears, Gen 17. 13. compared with Exod. 12. 44. 48. *And when a ſtranger ſhall ſojourn with thee, and will keep the Paſſeover, let all his Males be circumciſed, and* verſe 49. *One Law ſhall be to him that is home born, and unto the ſtrager that ſojourneth among you.*

Thus

Thus we see the Law is as expres for the circumcising Proselites and their males, as for *Israel* themselves *Diodate* also expounds the first place by the second (The servant that is born) *meaning* (saith he) *the Proselite who of his own free will shall add himself to the Church by the profession of Gods true worship.*

But now, if we admit Dr. *S.* his rule, that the measure as to the capacity of Divine Institutions, must be fetched from the ends thereof, yet will he be so farr from gaining, that he will quite lose his cause. For, if by the ends of Baptism he means the things signified in Baptism (as that he does, for he said they who are capable of the thing signified ought not to be denyed the sign) then we shall certainly gain one thing out of two and either of them will serve our turn to shew his mistake, *viz.* either Infants are not capable of Baptism, because not capable of *all things* signified thereby, or else, that the Protestants do violate their own rule in denying Infants some other holy signs, as general as Baptism, when yet they are capable of some of the things signified thereby, and this shall evidently appear by running the parralell between us, as to the grounds upon which you deny Infants the priviledge of the Lords Table, and we deny them Baptism. And first.

1. The things signified by the Lords Table (as the ends of that Institution) is Christ Crucified for us, and to come again to receive us to himself, of these mercies Infants are capable, because they shall be saved by the death and comming of the Lord Jesus, thus they have the thing signified yet you deny them the sign because they *understand not* the thing represented by the sign. Answerable to this we say, by Baptism is signified the death and resurection of Christ and our salvation thereby, of this mercy signified in Baptism Infants are capable but yet the sign is not given to them because they understand not the thing signified thereby.

2. The ends, or things signified by the Lords Table, on our part are, the profession of our faith, the manifestation of our union with the Church, *&c.* of these ends Infants are not capable, therefore then do not admit them to the Lords Table.

Answerable to this we say, the things signified in baptism on our part, are the profession of our faith, and manifestation of our union with the Saints, *&c.* of these ends Infants are not capable, therefore we admit them not to baptism.

3. Our

3. Our coming to the Lords Table holds forth abſtainence from the Levened bread of malice and wickedneſs, and our feeding upon the unleavened bread of ſincerity and truth; of theſe ends (as they are duties) Infants are not capable, therefore you admit them not to the Lords Table.

Anſwerable to this we ſay, baptiſm holds forth our death to ſin and the newneſs of life from our baptiſm to the end, of theſe ends of baptiſm Infants are not capable, and therefore we admit them not to baptiſm, *for the rule and meaſure as to the capacity of divine Inſtitutions is to be fetched from the ends of them.*

The ſame might be ſaid concerning the impoſition of hands with prayer for the Spirit of Promiſe, ſeeing it was practiſed by the Apoſtles upon the newly baptiſed indifferently, yet you admit no Infants to this Divine Inſtitution, though you ſuppoſe them to be baptiſed, although according to Proteſtant Doctrine they are capable of the promiſe *Act.* 2. 38, 39. And the benediction ſignified, and obtained thereby by which your inconſiſtancy with your own rule is further manifeſted and hence I infer (according to your own words) *by a parity of reaſon built on equal grounds*, you ought not to baptiſe Infants *becauſe the rule and meaſure, as to Divine Inſtitutions, or the capacity of the ſubjects thereof are to be fetched from the ends thereof.*

Not from ſome ends only (and thoſe too only which we pleaſe) as Dr. *S* doth unadviſedly teach, for ſo there would be no Man, or but very few, but might be brought to Baptiſm, or other ordinances, ſeeing they are capable of ſeveral things ſignified therein, as the death of Chriſt for the ſins of the world and his Reſurection, by which all ſhall riſe again; and whether they believe it or no, yet he is the Lord that bought them, and a mediator between God and them, that his long-ſuffering might lead them to repentance

Wherefore your inſtance of our Saviours being baptiſed without repentance avails you nothing, unleſs you were able to prove a ſpecial caſe to be a general rule for the practiſe of ordinances, which yet you cannot but know is pernicious many ways, nor can you rationally believe that becauſe Chriſt who was no ſinner was baptized without repentance, that therefore you muſt baptiſe ſinners without repentance alſo; if otherwiſe, then why may not Perſons be admitted to the Lords Table without ſelf examination, ſeeing Chriſt did partake of it without ſelf examination, having no need to do ſo? certainly though Chriſt did this it ſhall never

be demonſtrated that the Members of his Church may do it without ſelf examination, and yet thus went the matter in old time for hundreds of years together, ſo true is the maxim admit one abſurdity and more will follow.

But to make an end of this, its evident: Chriſt in being baptiſed did his duty to God, and had he not been baptiſed he had not fulfilled all righteouſneſs; Let it now be ſhewed that it s the duty of infants to be baptiſed, or that they or any body elſe commits ſin in refuſing infant baptiſm, and then we ſhall ſtand upon no further capacity on their part nor oppoſe this inſtance as to the end for which it is brought but till this be done we juſtly reject ſuch Argumentation.

Neither is it true, that what we ſay of the incapacity of infants &c. reflects upon the wiſdom of God in appointing circumciſion for infants, for Gods command made them fit ſubjects for it, together with the nature of the covenant which he made with *Abraham*, and his, according to the fleſh, which covenant he alſo ordained to be in their Fleſh by circumciſion, *Gen.* 17. 13. Now therefore when it ſhall appear, that the covenant of the Goſpel, (I mean it, as eſtabliſhed by Chriſt in his Church) is made with any Man and his ſeed according to the Fleſh, and that God hath required the Goſpel covenant ſhould be in their Fleſh by baptiſm, and ſo every infant born of them, or ſervant bought with Money to be baptiſed, we ſhall then grant that to inſiſt on the incapacity of infants would reflect upon the wiſdom of God, but ſith this neither is, nor can be done, all theſe pretended reflections falls really upon Dr. S. for denying infants the Lords Supper, becauſe of their incapacity, who yet were admitted to the Paſſeover, of which they were as uncapable as of the Lords Table.

What the Dr. ſays further *of the ends of baptiſm to repreſent and exhibit the nature of the grace of the Goſpel and to confirm the truth of the covenant on Gods part*: We have conſidered before, and to what you here add, ſaying, *It inſtates the partakers of it in the priviledges of the Church of God*, I anſwer,

That though the Dr. ſpeaks right according to the right adminiſtration of baptiſm, yet according to his way of infant baptiſm it is not ſo, ſeeing we all know, infants (while ſuch) though ſprinkled have no more priviledge in your Church then thoſe who are not ſprinkled, for the priviledges next following baptiſm, is to be taught to obſerve all things whatſoever Chriſt commanded, and to continue in fellowship with the Church in breaking of Bread and prayer, *Acts* 2 42. *Mat.* 28. 20. Now

to

to tell us that infants are inſtated in theſe things, and yet whilſt infants have nothing at all to do with them is too groſs a vanity. For,

If you ſay they are inſtated in theſe priviledges upon future contingences, *viz.* Repentance, Faith and newneſs of Life according to the Goſpel, I anſwer when this comes to paſs they are no infants, nor as infants partake of theſe priviledges, but as thoſe that are now the Sons of God by faith, and thus truly all infants are inſtated in Church priviledges as ſoon as born, ſeeing by the death of Chriſt they have a right upon the conditions of the Goſpel when capable to perform them, thus you miſlead the world with a ſpecious pretence of inſtating their infants in Church priviledges, when 'tis only an empty ſound of words.

But the *Jews* Infants as they were inſtated in the priviledges of their Church, by circumiſion, ſo they entred upon the enjoyment of their priviledges in infancy, appearing by Gods commandment three times a year in the Temple with the offerings accuſtomed and to partake of the Paſſeover, with the congregation or family where it was eaten.

The Dr. ſaith, *nothing can ſeem wanting of the ends of Baptiſm* (in reſpect of Infants) *but that which ſeems moſt cerimonial which is the perſonal reſtipulation, which yet may reaſonably be ſupplyed by Sponſors*, &c.

That there is much wanting beſide this reſtipulation in your infant baptiſm is shewed before, and it is unadviſedly ſaid that the reſtipulation of the perſon baptiſed is the moſt ceremonial thing in baptiſm, ſeeing it is the moral and ſubſtantial part being indeed our covenanting with God and in truth the external washing is far more ceremonial as appears 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. And for your ſaying that the perſonal reſtipulation in baptiſm may be reaſonably ſupplyed by Godfathers, is very much below the reaſon of any Chriſtian to affirm; But is it ſo? that Sponſors may ſupply the perſonal reſtipulation, which is the greater, then let them alſo ſupply the leſſer, to wit ſprinkling with water, which they can better perform, then the covenant they make for the infant, and then the whole buſineſs will appear to have the ſame reaſonableneſs in every part, *viz.* wholly unreaſonable.

Thus much touching the capacity of infants &c. Next the Dr tells us, *That in the Inſtitution of Baptiſm there is neither direct nor conſequential prohibition of Infants to be baptized, and that there is nothing that nature pretended before the laſt comiſſion, Mat.* 28. 19. But here is of

a

a miſtake, and its ſtrange he never obſerved that it hath often been demonſtrated that, as when Circumciſion firſt appeared in the world, it clearly took in the Infants of thoſe to whom it was firſt given, ſo, accordingly it was propagated; But when Baptiſm firſt appeared in the world, it as clearly left out the Infants of thoſe to whom it was firſt miniſtred, and accordingly was propagated by the holy Apoſtles, inſomuch that of the many thouſands, and famous Churches, that were baptiſed, all the world is not able to ſhew ſo much as one Infant to have been baptiſed in any one of them, nor one word of precept for ſo doing, and if this be not ſo much as a conſequential prohibition of Infant baptiſm, I ſhall never believe that the Dr. or any elſe can hew me ſo much as a conſequential prohibition, of Infants receiving the Lords Supper, the impoſition of hands &c.

And though the Dr. conſider never ſo much what apprehenſions the Apoſtles had concerning the Church ſtate of ſuch as were in external Covenant with God, yet he cannot rationally imagine that *they ſhould meaſure the ſtate of the Goſpel Churches by the reaſon of the Covenant which God made with the* Jews *and their Seed according to the fleſh.* Seeing it is expreſly ſaid *from henceforth*, to wit from the vanishing of the old Covenant, *know we no Man after the fleſh*---But now *if any Man be in Chriſt he is a new Creature.* And now Men are not to be accounted of the Church becauſe they are *Abraham*s Seed, but they are accounted *Abraham*s Seed by being in the Church of Chriſt, *Gal.* 3. 29. *If ye be Chriſts then are you* Abraham's *Seed, and Heirs according to promiſe.*

Neither is it true that *Chriſt commanded his Apoſtles to gather whole Nations into Churches*, as the Dr. *affirms*, neither did the Apoſtles gather any one whole Nation, or City into a Church State that we read of, therefore Churches conſiſting of whole Nations, Men, Women and Infants, are not Apoſtollical But this the Apoſtles did they taught many Nations, i.e. their ſound went through many Nations, not that they taught all manner of Perſons in the Nations, for they taught no Infants, and the perſons by them gathered into the Church, were only ſuch as received their Doctrine, as appears by thoſe Families where their Goſpel was received, the Husband ſometimes oppoſite to the Wife, and otherwhiles the Wife to the Husband Servants and Maſters likewiſe differing in the ſame Family about chriſtianity, 1. *Cor.* 7. If then the Apoſtles did not gather whole Families into a church ſtate unleſs they did wholly believe, Act. 16. how ſhould any Man imagine, they gathered whole Nations? the greateſt

part

part whereof by all experience are wicked persons yea in those very Nations, which Men pretend to have made into churches of Christ of which would God *England* were not so full an evidence as it is this day.

The Dr. grants that the order of words Mat. 28, 19. (Teach all Nations baptising them) was necessary for those who were then to be proselited to Christianity. And we say they are as necessary for the generations following, who have as much need of true Faith and Repentance, or the first principles of Christianity in order to their being Christians, as them that went before, and it is a pernitious alteration of the order of Christs commission, to out-run it s direction so, as to make persons to be Christians, before they do or can know the least title of Christianity.

The case which the Dr. puts, about going to Disciple the Indians Baptising them, is not at all rational, but upon the pre-supposition, that the person so doing, to have seen or known them, that gives him his authority to Baptise infants, and then indeed it's rational to suppose such a Person would not understand that the words, Disciple the Indians Baptising them, would exclude infants. But yet I must also say, that his ground to believe so could not arise from the words themselves but from the practice presupposed. Wherefore the Apostles having direction to teach all Nations Baptising them, without the least knowledge of any Infants Baptized by any Baptists which were before them, or from whom they received their authority, here is no place for the Drs. suppositions at all.

As little cause hath he to think that had any one said to *Abraham* he that believeth and is circumcised shall be saved, it ought so to have been interpreted, as that infants ought to be circumcized. For if this had been all the rule given for circumcision, it must of necessity have been limited to such as believe only, and unless the Dr. know how from good ground to satisfie his conscience, that Infants are believers of that which is taught or Preached according to *Mark* 16. (which place he aludes unto) he must so limit the diversion for baptising. But if indeed he take Infants to be such believers, then he is answered by Dr. *Hammond* in his Let. of Resol. p. 297. who saith, as for the Question whether Infants have faith? I profess my self to be none of those who are concerned in it. I freely confess to believe, Faith to be so necessarily founded in understanding, that they that have not understandisg cannot have faith, whethe actual or habitual.

The

The concluſion therefore is, ſith in the caſe you put, the word (believe) cannot concern infants, and that they muſt be deemed capable of Salvation, though they believe not, it is every way ſafe to think them unconcern d in the other duty, that paſſage *Mark* 16. 16. or any other like unto it notwithſtanding.

Finally the Dr. propoſes five conſiderations about the ſuitableneſs of Infant baptiſm to the adminiſtration of things under the Goſpel, and firſt he ſaith.

1. *That if it had been Chriſts intention to exclude Infants, there had been far greater reaſon for an expreſs prohibition then for an expreſs command, if his intention were to admit them, becauſe this was ſuitable to the general grounds of Gods diſpenſation among them before.*

Anſwer, Here is little ſaid but what hath been anſwered before, and may be anſwered by ſaying, had it been Chriſts intention that infants ſhould not be admitted to the Lords Table there had been more need of an expreſs prohibition, &c. then of an expreſs command, &c. becauſe ſuitable to Gods diſpenſations among them before. Thus *Argumentum ad hominem.*

But I anſwer further, it is dangerous arguing to our preſent right to Sacraments, from Gods diſpenſations among the *Jews*, ſeeing the ſtate of the Church, and the diſpenſation is ſo much altered as that the former was but carnal, in reſpect of the Spirituality of the other.

2. The Dr. ſaith, *it is very hard to conceive that the Apoſtles thought Infants excluded by Chriſt, when after Chriſts aſcention they looked upon themſelves bound to obſerve the Jewiſh Cuſtomes, even when they had baptized many thouſands,*

Anſwer, It is ill ſaid that the Apoſtles were bound to obſerve any ſuch Jewiſh Cuſtomes becauſe of any ſuitableneſs between them and things under the Goſpel (which is the mark you ought to hit or you ſay nothing) but the reaſon why they did obſerve ſuch Cuſtomes for a time, was the weakneſs of the *Jews*, and we find the Apoſtles did as ſpeedily put a period to ſuch Cuſtomes as they could *Acts* 15. 24. to 32. *Acts* 16 4 5. which clearly ſhews *Jewiſh* Cuſtomes was not ſuitable to things under the *Goſpel*, and here circumciſion one of the chief of *Jewiſh* rites, is clearly aboliſhed among the reſt, ſo that a man would think infant baptiſm ſhould never have been built upon it.

3. The Dr ſaith *If admiſſion of infants to Baptiſm were a meer relique of judaiſm, it ſeems ſtrange that none of the judaizing Chriſtians ſhould be charged with it; who yet are charged with the obſervation of other judaical rites.*

Anſwer,

Answer, I find no man saying that Infant baptism was a relique of judaism, save Dr. *Hammond*, and some from him, and he indeed would make believers baptism also a jewish relique whiles he teaches that the jews baptising Proselites, and their Children was the Original, and the baptism of the Christian Church but the Coppy, by which device he hath opened a gap to our late *Nationists* to deprive the Church of sacred baptism altogether, and hath done more to weaken the cause of infant baptism then any other of its favourites, in laying its foundation in jewish ceremonies, for which they had no clear command from God. But great is this truth of believers baptism, and will stand notwithstanding the injury done by Dr. *Hammond*. for it was no jewish rite, the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins was from Heaven, *Mat.* 21. 25. and the Pharisees who were zealous enough for jewish rites, rejected holy baptism, which Christ affirms to be the counsel of God *Lu.* 7. 30. and testifies out of the consciences of his enemies, that he that teaches otherwise denyes *John* to be a Prophet. This then is the thing that truly seems strange, that no mention is made of infant baptism, if indeed it was at all received in the Christian Church either as a jewish rite or otherwise, but not strange at all that none is charged with it, seeing none can be named that held it.

4. Since the jewish Christians were so much offended *saith the* Dr. at the neglect of circumcision, *Acts* 21. Can we in reason think they should quietly bear their children being wholly thrown out of the church, as they would have been, if neither admitted by circumcision nor baptism.

Answer, Since the false Apostles was so earnest to have the christians circumcise their children, it's strange that none of the true Apostles could or would quiet them by saying instead of infant circumcision you have infant baptism if indeed there had been any such thing practiced, For, this way went the *Apostle Paul* to still them, vvhen they would have brought the believers themselves under circumsion, *Col.* two. Telling the chriftians they vvere circumcised vvith the circumcision made vvithout hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the Flesh by the Circumcision of Christ, buried vvith him in baptism, vvherein ye also are risen with him through the Faith, &c. And why might not the jews as quietly take the non-admission of infants to baptism, as they so took the non-admission of them to the Lords Supper seeing they were formerly admitted to the Passeover, nor is it necessary to say, that though they were not admitted to either of these, that therefore they are wholly thrown out of the Church; For,

If by church be meant the whole number of the saved, then are infants of the churchs for Christ hath told us the kingdom of God belongs to infants, and thus were infants of the church before circumcision was for some thousands of years: But if by church be meant those only vvho are concerned in the actual profession of the gospel, in this respect I grant infants are not of the church, God having no vvhere required this of infants in his gospel. Infants are nowv as vvell as before the Flood, vvithin the covenant of the gospel in respect of the grace of eternal Life, but are not under the duties of the Covenant, to vvit, Repentance, Faith baptism perseverance, &c.

Nor can my calling the whole number of the saved the church, and thus making infants a part thereof offend a Protestant who is acquainted with Protestant doctrines, seeing Mr. *Rogers Cath. Doctrine* p. 73. upon Art. 19. of *the Church of*

Eng-

England, doth affirm, there is an invisible Church, and takes all within the compass of this Church who are elect, tryumphing or that shall tryumph in Heaven Dr. *Field* takes into his definition of the Church all the Elect, of Men or Angels, caled, or not yet called. l. 1. c. 8. So that according to these definitions of the church, infants are not thrown out of the Church though not of the number of the called, and consequently not that cause for the jews to complain, nor any other which the Dr. doth imagine; unless they be not acquainted with the extent of the covenant of Gods grace in Christ Iesus our Lord.

Five, The doctor lastly tells us, *That had it been contrary to Christs institution* (to baptise infants) *we should not have had such evidence of it's early Practice in the Church, and here I acknowledge the use of Apostolical Tradition to manifest this to us.*

Answer, This is altogether unlike a Protestant: What are the Sacraments so darkly laid down in the Scripture that we know not when and to whom they belong without Tradition? but when shall we see this Tradition *Apostolical*, I think doctor *Taylor* expresly denies there is any Tradition apostolical. lib. prophes. p. 117. 120.

But the doctor cannot but know there be errours which crept into the Church even in the apostles days, which also continued in some of them, notwithstanding all endeavours to purge them, such were circumcision and keeping the Law. Or if we list to reckon with records of antiquity, 'tis easie to show some things held by Papists and opposed by the doctor are better proved by tradition then infant baptism, for example the Lent Fast ond prayer for the dead, this is not denyed by Mr. Perkins demonst. prob. What then shall be gained to the protestant Religion by such Traditional arguments.

It is a notable saying of *Irenæus* (according to Dr. *Fulk*) *When the Hereticks are reproved out of the Scriptures they fall to accusing the Scriptures as if all is not well in them-- and that the Truth cannot be found out of them that know not the Tradition.* And saith *Tertul*, (according to Dr. *Fulk*) *Take away those things from the Hereticks, which they hold with Ethnicks, that they may stay their Questions upon Scripture only.*

FINIS.

ERRATA.

P. 3. l. 5. r. is right, p. 4. l. 25. r. of a Midwife p. 5. l. 34. for these r. those p. 7. l. 27. for others r. overs.